arXiv:cond-mat/0503532v1 [cond-mat.dis-nn] 21 Mar 2005

# Reply to `cond-mat/0503325`: Comment on 'Generating functional analysis of Minority Games with real market histories' by KH Ho, WC Man, FK Chow and HF Chau

ACC Coolen
Department of Mathematics, King's College London

The Comment `cond-mat/0503325` is built around two core statements, both of which are plainly incorrect. Let me summarize:

- *'In his recent paper [1] Coolen investigated the dynamics of the standard version of MG using the real and fake histories by the generating functional method of De Dominicis [2]. In particular, he concluded that macroscopic quantities for the standard version of MG have the same values for the games using real and fake histories in the symmetric phase (that is, when $\alpha < \alpha_c$) [1].'*

  Incorrect: Nowhere in [1] is this either concluded, stated or even hinted at.

  The formalism in [1] is first developed for arbitrary $\alpha$ (i.e. for both phases). The macroscopic laws are then solved, however, ONLY in the time-translation invariant ergodic regime. No claims, or graphs relating to macroscopic observables are presented AT ALL for the non-ergodic phase $\alpha < \alpha_c$. The latter phase is only mentioned in footnote 8, which states, in contrast with the erroneous claim above, that 'below the critical point the differences between true and fake history (if any) are confined to dynamical phenomena or to states without time-translation invariance'.

- *'To arrive at this conclusion he made the bold assumption that the history correlation time $L_h$ is much less than the number of players $N$. Consequently, one could well approximate the finite samples of history occurrence frequencies by ... (1) ... While this assumption is valid in the asymmetric phase (that is, when $\alpha > \alpha_c$), .... eq. (1) does not hold in the symmetric phase.'*

  Incorrect: In [1] the relevant assumption (1) was made ONLY for the asymmetric phase.

  This second claim is once more incomprehensible. The relevant information is not exactly hard to find: even the very title of the section of [1] in which assumption (1) appears is called 'TTI states with short history correlation times', i.e. we are dealing with $\alpha > \alpha_c$ since time-translation invariance does not hold for $\alpha < \alpha_c$.

It is difficult to see how these mistakes could have been made. A proper reading of only the discussion section of [1], i.e. one page of plain text without any mathematical theory, would already have prevented Ho at al from making the above erroneneous claims (as there the restriction to TTI solutions is again mentioned explicitly).

It will be clear that Comments and Replies can be valuable, and that genuine mistakes in the interpretation of someone's work can help to disentangle subtle physical or mathematical arguments. Unfortunately, the Comment submitted by Ho et al is of a different type.